

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7 are presently pending. In the above-identified Office Action, Claims 1 – 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanson *et al.* ('835) hereinafter 'Hanson'.

For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject Application properly presents claims patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are requested.

The subject Application addresses the need in the art for a system or method for customizing search results based on an attribute of the source which is independent from the search request. The invention is set forth in Claims of varying scope of which Claim 7 is illustrative. Claim 7 recites:

7. A selective information retrieval system disposed at least in part in a computer system, said information retrieval system comprising:
first means for receiving an information retrieval request **from a first source**;
second means for receiving said information retrieval request from a second source; and
third means for retrieving first data for said first source in response to said request and for retrieving second data for said second source in response to said request **based on attribute of said first source or said second source, said attribute being independent of said request.** (Emphasis added.)

None of the references, taken alone or in combination, teach, disclose or suggest the invention as presently claimed. That is, none of the references teach, disclose or suggest an information retrieval system or method adapted to receive an information retrieval request from two or more sources and retrieve unique data for each source **based on an attribute of the source which is independent of the request.**

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims over Hanson. Hanson purports to teach a method and apparatus for high speed parallel execution of multiple points of logic across heterogeneous data sources. In accordance with the reference, user propounded requests activates a send agent at a local site and receive agents at remote sites to exchange a retrieval request via a script which, when interpreted causes the remote agents to retrieve data from an associated database and execute processes on the data as specified in the script request.

The Examiner suggests that inasmuch as col. 4, lines 38 – 40 of the reference read as follows:

“This example considers the client request as being received by an agent at the user site 19, although the request could be received by an agent at a remote site.”

the reference provides for an agent at a local site to be remote. The Examiner suggests that the first request source in Hanson corresponds to a source accessing the local site from a network and a second source corresponds to the user site of the agent. The Examiner then opines that the attribute of the source that is detected is the user-defined script. However, the user-defined script incorporates the data request (see Abstract and col. 4, lines 41 - 43). Accordingly, the script is not independent of the request as set forth in the present claims. Hence, Hanson clearly does not teach, disclose or suggest means for retrieving data **based on an attribute of the source which is independent of the request** as presently claimed.

Accordingly, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Travis J. Parry

By 
William J. Benman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,014

WJB/ns

Benman, Brown & Williams
2049 Century Park East
Suite 2740
Los Angeles, CA 90067

310-553-2400
310-553-2675 (fax)